FISCAL YEAR 2006

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Management and Operations of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (TJNAF)

The approved FY 2006 Performance Evaluation Plan associated with the current contract provides a sense of the Department of Energy's current thinking in accordance with SC guidance. After contract award, a Performance Evaluation Plan will be negotiated with the selected offeror for the period of performance remaining in FY 2006.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ..... **i**

GOAL 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership, & Timeliness of Research and Development) **1**

Objective 1.1 Impact (significance) ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Objective 1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments) **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Objective 1.3 Output (productivity) ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Objective 1.4 Delivery ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

GOAL 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities **5**

Objective 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2) 5
Objective 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4) 6
Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities 7
Objective 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facilities to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base 8

GOAL 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management **10**

Objective 3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision 10
Objective 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management 11
Objective 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications & Responsiveness to Customer Needs 12

GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory **16**

Objective 4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans 16
Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization 17
Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate 18

GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection **21**

Objective 5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment 21
Objective 5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management 22
Objective 5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention 24

GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) **26**

Objective 6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s) 26
Objective 6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s) 29
Objective 6.3 Assessment of Human Resources Management System 30
Objective 6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate 32

Objective 6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets 33

GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs 36

Objective 7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs 36

Objective 7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs 37

GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems 40

Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System 40

Objective 8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security 41

Objective 8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and Property 42

Objective 8.4 Provide and Efficient and Effective Program for the Protection of Sensitive Information 43

INTRODUCTION

This document entitled contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) describes the primary measurement basis for DOE's evaluation of Southeastern Universities Research Association (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2005, through September 30, 2006. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission and requirement performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

The Laboratory is a single program operation and the contract is a fixed fee, performance based management contract supported by the Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) of the Office of Science (SC). The primary budget authority is provided by NP and NP is the "landlord" in SC responsible for the Laboratory. Since this is a fixed fee contract, no performance fee is part of the contract and this PEMP will not be used to determine any performance or incentive fees.

The fee for FY 2006 is TBD. The fee is subject to change based upon contract extension negotiation.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the Thomas Jefferson Site Office (TJSO) and the appropriate HQ office or major customer. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The TJSO shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year. The TJSO and the contractor will follow the document entitled "Preliminary Guidance for the Office of Science Laboratory Performance Appraisal Process," dated June 8, 2005 as appropriate.

Section I below provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor will be determined.

Section II below provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

The following descriptions define each performance (measurement) level:

Performance Goal: A general overarching statement of the desired outcome for each major performance area that will be scored and reported annually under the appraisal process.

Performance Objective: A statement of desired results for an organization or activity. Note: The set of Performance Measures identified should be the primary means for determining the Contractor's performance in meeting the Performance Objective; however, other performance information available to the evaluator from other sources may be utilized in determining the overall performance rating of a Performance Objective.

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative method for characterizing performance to assist the reviewer in assessing achievement of the corresponding Performance Objective (i.e., what you would measure).

Performance Target: The desired condition, milestone, or target level of achievement for each Performance Measure (objective or subjective as appropriate), established at an appropriately detailed level that can be tracked and used for a judgment or decision on performance assessment.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING

The FY 2006 Contractor performance will be determined based upon performance evaluations measured and graded at the Objective level, which rollup to provide the performance evaluation determination for each Performance Goal. Each Performance Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities as well as the results of inspections, appraisals and reviews; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective and used in adjusting grades. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure 1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above.

TJSO and the HQ program offices, in coordination with the Contractor, developed Performance Measures and as applicable, targets for each Performance Objective. The Performance Measures

and Targets identify significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Performance Objective and will be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Performance Objective. The Performance Measures for each Performance Objective were developed so as to indicate, if fully met, the performance level required to obtain a "B+" evaluation grade. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, B, C, and F levels) and in those cases these details have been included in the PEMP. However these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Figure 1. **Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions**

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
		identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating DOE office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of

Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall score for each. The total score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations is compared to the letter grade scale found in Table B, below, to determine the overall S&T and M&O grades for FY 2006.

The raw score (rounded to the nearest hundredth) from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of identifying the overall letter grade as indicated in Table B.

Table A. FY 2006 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

S&T Performance Goal[1]	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			40%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			40%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			20%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			35%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			35%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			5%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			5%		
				Total Score	

[1] Weightings for each S&T Goal listed within Table A are preliminary, based on the averaged SC Program Office weightings according to the percentage of FY 2005 Budget Authority for each. *The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

Table B. FY 2006 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Adjustment to the Letter Grade

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements. Data to support rating adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), significant events or incidents within the control of the Contractor, or other reviews as appropriate.

The final Contractor performance-based grade for each Goal will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating adjustments made from the otherwise **earned** rating based on Performance Goal achievements.

II. Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to

develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2006.

GOAL 1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT (QUALITY, PRODUCTIVITY, LEADERSHIP, & TIMELINESS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)

The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is 40%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2005 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

- Office of Science - Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;

- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

A to A+	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
B+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor "guessed right" in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

A to A+	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
B^+	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
B	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

Objective 1.3 Provide and sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals;
- The quantity of output from experimental and theoretical research; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

Pass[2]	Not failing; see below.
Fail	Peer reviewers not satisfied; output not meeting general scientific standards; minimal progress against FWPs.

Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals and milestones;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises, and getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

Pass[3]	**Not failing; see below.**
Fail	Peer reviewers, HQ not satisfied; significant number of milestones not met, results not delivered to community while it matters.

Table 1-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office[4]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		

[2] The numerical grade for pass is 4.3 and for fail it is 0.7.

[3] The numerical grade for pass is 4.3 and for fail it is 0.7.

[4] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall NP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			99%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1-3 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF FACILITIES

The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and is responsive to the user community.

The weight of this goal is 40%

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge user facilities and equipment to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for external scientists to add substantial value to their research by their utilization of facilities and equipment and the Contractor's implementation of seamless management systems that ensures R&D resources are available for use to the maximum extent possible.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

- Office of Science - Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (<99%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.1 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.2 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by SC. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B^+, the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

Objective 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

A to A+	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
B+	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.

B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users

A to A+	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.
B^{+}	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
B	The facility fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low, beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations, The facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values.

	Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state **and/or** the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

Objective 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facilities to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base; and
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders using the facility.

A to A+	Reviews document how multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways and reviews document that full advantage has been taken of the facility to strengthen the laboratory's research base.
B^{+}	Reviews state strong and effective team approach exists toward establishing an internal user community; laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few indigenous staff use the facility, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Table 2-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office[5]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			65%		

[5] A complete listing of S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Nuclear Physics			100%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 2-3 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of project/program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2005 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science - Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) ((<1%)
- Office of Science - Biological and Environmental Research (BER) ((<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Science - Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) ((<1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objective 3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
B+	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
C	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
D	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
F	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

Objective 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or user facility strategic plans
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B^{+}	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.

B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

Objective 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications & Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what)

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues.
B^{+}	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt.
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Table 3-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office[6]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall NP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			99%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

[6] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Table 3-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Attachment 1

Office of Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings for FY 2006

SC Program Offices	ASCR	BER	NP	WDTS
Goal 1 - Mission Accomplishment				
Goal Weight	**70%**	**75%**	**40%**	**65%**
1.1 Impact	40%	30%	40%	25%
1.2 Leadership	30%	20%	30%	30%
1.3 Output	15%	20%	15%	30%
1.4 Delivery	15%	30%	15%	15%
Goal 2 - Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities				
Goal Weight	**0**	**0%**	**40%**	**0**
2.1 Design of Facility	0	0	20%	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication	0	0	0%	0
2.3 Operation of Facility	0	0%	65%	0
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base	0	0%	15%	0
Goal 3 –The Contract Provides Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management				
Goal Weight	**30%**	**25%**	**20%**	**35%**
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	35%	20%	40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management	35%	30%	40%	40%
3.3 Program Management – Communication and Responsiveness to HQ	30%	50%	20%	40%

GOAL 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY

The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of this Goal is 35%.

The Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the performance measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of performance measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 4.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 4.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Quality of the Vision developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan for achieving the approved Laboratory vision;
- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan;
- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; and
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advances the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities

The overall performance (outcomes/results) of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective.

Measure 4.1.1 The vision (20-year outlook) is solidly based on core competencies of world-leading caliber and extends and applies them to enhanced or new initiatives addressing outstanding science questions and national priorities.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor assures that the vision is appropriately reviewed and updated in light of current scientific experimental knowledge and theory.

Measure 4.1.2 The strategic plan identifies all critical success factors for the attainment of the vision and outlines means of assuring their realization.

FY 2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor assures that the strategic plan is realistic and achievable and reflective of the scientific, technical and management competencies of the laboratory; that it is in alignment with the laboratory's vision; and that it meets the expectations of DOE and the scientific community.

Measure 4.1.3 The business plan (5-year) is an ambitious but realistic document meeting both DOE's and Lab Management's needs to realize Lab objectives based on a clearly defined approach, identification of success factors, and ways to assure that they are met.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor ensures that the business plan is realistic in light of the constraints on the lab and maximizes the effective use of funds available to the lab in meeting the goals of the laboratory and its commitment to scientific excellence.

Measure 4.1.4 Formalized Collaborations and Corporate Citizenship programs

4.1.4.1 The Laboratory has formalized vital collaborations and understandings with institutions in academe, lab users, other national labs, and private sector entities for advancing priority issues in science, scientific workforce, and applications of science and technology.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor ensures that the laboratory has taken and exploited opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations and understandings with other organizations—and particularly with the lab user group.

4.1.4.2 The Laboratory has corporate citizenship programs that encourage community support of the laboratory and its programs and that draw on lab competencies and meet community needs. These corporate citizenship efforts include public outreach and improved scientific literacy. This responsibility of the laboratory is measured both by metrics and peer reviews. "Corporate citizenship" related tech transfer responsibilities of the contractor are covered under 4.1.5.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor ensures that the laboratory has taken effective measures to achieve a high level of public awareness of the laboratory and its achievements on behalf of DOE and the science community and to enhance pre-college science education in the local community by drawing on the resources of the laboratory.

Measure 4.1.5 The Laboratory has developed and implemented technology transfer and commercial applications and projects with other agencies to utilize effectively laboratory developed and related technologies especially in defense, homeland security and commerce. (Metrics for this goal are included in section 6 of this document.)

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The organization takes appropriate measures to encourage and promote laboratory technology transfer that effectively draws on laboratory technologies/capabilities to serve commercial and national interests. Laboratory effectiveness will be measured by metrics, e.g. patents issued, and peer reviews.

Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Leadership's, to include Corporate Office Leadership's, ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership, to include Corporate Office Leadership, in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

The overall performance (outcomes/results) of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective.

Measure 4.2.1 The Laboratory is staffed and structured in an optimum way to assure that it meets its overall goals; that there are clear assignments of staff responsibilities and performance goals and performance criteria; and that commensurate responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources are assigned.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor ensures that there is an effective process in place for assessing laboratory performance, and for addressing and appropriately resolving lab management deficiencies. The contractor ensures that an effective internal audit program is in place to assist in identifying and overcoming lab management deficiencies. (Internal audit metrics are included under goal 6 of this document.) The contractor also ensures that a logical succession management plan for the laboratory is developed and implemented.

Measure 4.2.2 The contractor will ensure that the organization has a structured quality program, that bench marking against national or international standards will be used; that important processes are mapped, measured, and improved; and that there is a structure to address urgent emerging issues.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): A quality assurance program will be maintained that responds effectively to lab issues and opportunities for continuous improvement. An effective and comprehensive action item tracking and implementation system will be established and used.

Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Corporate Office involvement in and support of business and other infrastructure process and procedure improvements;
- The willingness to enter into and effectiveness of joint appointments when appropriate; and
- Where appropriate, the willingness to develop and work with the Department in implementing innovative financing agreements and/or provide private investments into the Laboratory.

The overall effectiveness/performance of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective.

Measure 4.3.1 The contractor will ensure that outside, nationally recognized, expertise in such areas as project management, IT organization, risk assessment, and a variety of business disciplines will be made available on an as needed basis for the solution of emerging problems or for improvement in processes.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor will provide the necessary expertise to review and assess laboratory operations in key operational areas. These reviews will focus on major programmatic areas to identify significant areas for improvement. Corporate leadership will ensure the timely and appropriate implementation of review recommendations.

Measure 4.3.2 Key staff have university appointments, joint positions for young, promising researchers are routinely available, and means (such as time limited fellowships) are used to cycle a stream of highly accomplished researchers through the lab.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): In addition to laboratory activities in this area, the contractor will continue to use fellowships, sabbaticals, and awards to ensure an active user participation in the life and science of the laboratory.

Measure 4.3.3 The contractor will initiate ways to secure outside investment in the laboratory or to enter into innovative financing of infrastructure or scientific apparatus on an as needed basis.

FY2006 Target (B+, 3.4): The contractor will identify, as needed, alternate financing opportunities that will provide for investment in the laboratory. The contractor will ensure that the Residence Facility at the lab is operated in an environmentally sound and user-friendly manner. The contractor will strive on an on-going basis to identify quality of life issues whose resolution will aid users of the residence facility.

Table 4-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plan			35%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			35%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Contractor Support			30%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The contractor shall sustain excellence and enhance effectiveness of integrated safety, health, and environmental protection. (The goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement ISM down through and across the organization; and provide effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.)

The weight of this Goal 35%.

The Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement Integrated Safety Management across the organization; and provide effective and efficient environmental protection.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned a numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist DOE in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the DOE from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 5.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 5.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment

Measure 5.1.1The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance as measured by the day away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate. Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office if Science's FY05 and FY07 goals for DART (0.5 and 0.25, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements

Performance Level	Measure Score
DART Rate 0.25	3.9
DART Rate 0.38	3.4
DART Rate 0.60	3.0
DART Rate 0.80	2.0
DART Rate 1.10	0.0

Note: Measure scores for actual DART rates between the Performance Levels above are assigned by Linear Interpolation, using the immediate bounding upper and lower criteria (e.g. A DART performance of 0.30 corresponds to a score of 3.71

(A-). For scores higher than "A", the bounding upper criterion for the interpolation will be a DART = 0.0, which corresponds to a score of A+ (4.3).

Measure 5.1.2 The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance as measured by the total reportable case rate (TRCR). Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science's FY05 and FY07 goals for TRC (1.17 and 0.65, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements

Performance Level	Measure Score
TRCR 0 .65	3.9
TRCR 0.91	3.4
TRCR 1.2	3.0
TRCR 2.0	2.0
TRCR 2.5	0.0

Note: Measure scores for actual TRCR between the Performance Levels above are assigned by Linear Interpolation, using the immediate bounding upper and lower criteria (e.g. A TRCR performance of 0.60 corresponds to a score of 3.93 (A). For scores higher than "A", the bounding upper criterion for the interpolation will be a TRCR = 0.0, which corresponds to a score of A+ (4.3).

Objective 5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- An open reporting culture is maintained at the Laboratory while appropriately responding to ESH&Q incidents/emergencies
- Identification of root causes to ES&H non-compliances and implementation of corrective actions
- Extent of the Lab's participation in working with other SC Laboratories or other entities/organizations outside SC in both giving and receiving external safety program audits as to advance staff skills and facilitate the sharing of lessons learned.

The overall performance (outcomes/results) of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective.

Measure 5.2.1Effective self assessment program

Performance Level	Measure Score
Revitalized management self assessment (MSA) program in place on or before 10/15/05 and 10 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized independent assessment (IA) program in place on or before 10/15/05 and 6 IAs completed in FY06	3.9
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 1/1/06 and 6 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized IA program in place on or before1/1/06 and 4 IAs completed in FY06	3.4
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 4/1/06 and 3 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized IA program in place on or before 1/1/06 and 3 IAs completed in FY06	3.0
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 4/30/06 IA program in place by 4/1/06 and 2 IAs completed in FY06	2.0
No MSA program in place by end of FY06 No IA program in place by end of FY06	0.0

Note: All performance conditions must be attained within a given scoring range to qualify.

Measure 5.2.2Effective EH&S Program measured by results of Radiological Control Program Peer review and annual individual doses. Dose period is from July 1 2005 through June 30, 2006 due to dosimeter processing (calendar year cycle) and processed every 6 months.

Performance Level	Measure Score
A program peer review resulting in identification of only minor program opportunities for improvement and recognition of programmatic best management practices and participation with outside RadCon programs to share lessons learned	3.9
A program peer review resulting in only minor deficiencies and no programmatic breakdown; no individual dose >200 mrem	3.4
A program peer review identifying one significant deficient program element directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >300 mrem	3.0
A program peer review identifying two to three significantly deficient program elements directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >500 mrem	2.0
A program peer review identifying more than three significantly deficient program elements directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >1000 mrem	0.0

Objective 5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention

For the purposes of this measure: an Administrative environmental permit violation is a violation in which data or other information is reported late; a technical environmental permit violation is a violation in which a parameter (e.g. pH) is outside permit requirements or in which a required analysis or sampling is incorrectly carried out.

Measure 5.3.1Environmental Management System Implementation to ISO 14001 standards.

Performance Level	Measure Score
Submission of 1 DOE P2 award application and SURA self declaration of EMS implementation on or before 10/20/05	3.9
No more than 1 administrative environmental permit violation and SURA self declaration of EMS implementation on or before 11/20/05	3.4
No more than 2 administrative and 1 technical environmental permit violations	3.0
No more than 3 administrative violations or no more than 1 environmental exceedence resulting in significant environmental impact of > 30 days. JSO declaration not achieved on or before 12/30/05 due to unresolved questions from validation	2.0
More than 2 environmental exceedences resulting in significant environmental impact of > 30 days	0.0

Note: All performance conditions must be attained within a given scoring range to qualify.

Table 5-1Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			55%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			35%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			10%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S)

The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s).

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Provide Business Systems that Efficiently and Effectively Support the Overall Mission of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 6.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 6.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)

Measure 6.1.1Demonstrate an effective financial management system through external reviews and internal and external audits

Performance Level	Measure Score
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations. All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner.	3.9
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than one Unallowable cost finding from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations. All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner	3.4
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than two Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations.	3.0

All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner.	
No more than one material/major finding (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than three Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. Failure to initiate corrective actions on any identified problem.	2.0
All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.	0.0

Measure 6.1.2 World-class Financial Management Organization

Performance Level	Measure Score
Strong foundation of control and accountability throughout the Lab organization. Evidence of clear and strong executive leadership on financial matters. Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. All staff attends one course, conference or seminar related to their work.	3.9
Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. All staff attends one course, conference or seminar related to their work.	3.4
Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. 75% of staff attends one course, conference or seminar related to their work.	3.0
Personnel turnover in financial organization has negative impacts on the ability of the organization to meet its mission. No evidence of training or resources devoted for professional development.	2.0
All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.	0.0

Measure 6.1.3 Accounting and Budget

Performance Level	Measure Score
Meet all transition deadlines for finance as part of the transition to a new contract. Budget submissions and calls for information are responsive, timely, complete and justifiable/defendable. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.9
Budget submissions and calls for information are responsive, timely, complete and justifiable/defendable. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.4
95% of standard and 90% of written ad hoc DOE requests with one day turnaround or more for financial information are submitted by requested deadline. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.0
90% of standard and 90% of written ad hoc DOE requests with one day turnaround or more for financial information are submitted by requested deadline. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Significant issues/problems identified with cost accounting practices utilized and indirect rates.	2.0
All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.	0.0

Objective 6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)

Measure 6.2.1 Demonstrate efficacy of the acquisition system through outstanding results on annual performance measures that cover critical aspects of the procurement process.

Performance Level	Measure Score
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 98.0%	3.9
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 90.0%	3.4
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 85.0%	3.0
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 75.0%	2.0
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score < 75.0%	0.0

Measure 6.2.2 Demonstrate the efficacy of the property management system through outstanding results on annual performance measures that cover critical aspects of JLab's personal property management.

Performance Level	Measure Score
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 98.0%	3.9
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 90.0%	3.4
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 85.0%	3.0
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Total Score $\geq$ 75.0%	2.0
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Total Score < 75.0%	0.0

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new programs).

Objective 6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective & Responsive Human Resources Management System

Measure 6.3.1 Balanced Score Card (BSC) results based on the following targets

MEASURE	TARGET
Diversity	
1. Protected class representation	85%
2. Protected class development opportunities	90%
Benefits	
3. Premium increases vs. the market	+2%
Compensation	
4. Alignment with market	±3.0%
Retention of Talent	
5. Attrition rate of top performers	7%
Recruitment	
6. Acceptance rate of employment offers	85%
Internal Business Process	
7. Annual review of policies/procedures	6

Performance level	Measure Score
6 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.9
5 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.4
4 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.0
3 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	2.0
2 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	0.0

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new programs).

BSC Methodology for Objective 6.3.1

A. Measure 1- Diversity- Protected Class Representation: Representation of protected classes (PC) within each EEO-1 category at the end of the fiscal year compared to the beginning of the fiscal year (adjusted for voluntary separations).

Scoring:

$$\text{PC Assessment Factor} = \frac{\%\text{ of PC to total workforce at the end of FY within each EEO-1 category}}{\%\text{ of PC to total workforce at the beginning of FY within each EEO-1 category}}$$

where:

Total Workforce = Total number of regular and term employees (excludes casuals, temps, and students)

EEO-1 Category = Occupational job categories as defined by EEOC (N=10)

Protected Classes (PC) = Women and minorities as defined by EEOC (N = 20): 2PC * 10 EEO-1 CATEGORIES

Note: EEO-1 categories where Utilization percentages meet or exceed 80% of availability percentages are determined to be fully in compliance with this metric.

Target: Maintain 85% of protected classes representation

B. Measure 2- Diversity- Protected Class Development Opportunities: Implement an assessment of delivery of training to protected classes (PC) (minority and female).

Scoring: % of protected classes participation in job related training vs. % of non-protected classes taking job related training (JRT). Scored by comparing relevant population for each course; PC participation rate vs. non-protected class participation rate. Summed over all JRT courses.

Target: At least equal participation in 90% of courses

C. Measure 3- Compensation- Premium Increases vs. the Market: Three-year rolling average of annual increases in medical insurance premium cost relative to market.

Scoring: Difference in the laboratory's percent increase in medical insurance premium compared to the market trend percent increase in medical insurance premiums averaged over three years.

Target: No more than 2% above market

D. Measure 4- Benefits- Alignment with the Market: Achieve compensation positions aligned with market practices to reflect the Lab's mid-market compensation philosophy.

Scoring:

$$\text{Compensation Factor} = \frac{\sum (\text{weighted average salary within each classification})}{\sum (\text{weighted salary range midpoint* within each classification})}$$

*Assumes salary range midpoints reflect mid-market position

Target: Compensation Factor within $\pm$3.0% of market average

E. Measure 5- Retention of Talent- Attrition rate of Top Performers.

Scoring: Percentage of top performers (employees who receive the top two performance ratings) who voluntarily separate from the Laboratory

Note: Excludes involuntary terminations due to funding issues, restructuring or contractor turnover. Excludes voluntary terminations due to retirement, or participation in a voluntary separation program or early retirement program.

Target: Less than 7%

F. Measure 6- Recruitment- Acceptance Rate of Employment Offers.

Scoring: The number of employment offers accepted divided by the total number of offers extended.

Target: 85%

G. Measure 7- Internal Business Practices- Annual Review of Policies/Procedures.

Scoring: Number of policies/processes reviewed annually

Target: 6 or more

Objective 6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate

Measure 6.4.1 Internal audits completed in accordance with annual audit plan[1]

Performance Level	Measure Score
Completes all audits on plan and meets management requests for special audits	3.9
Completes all audits on plan	3.4
Completes ≥ 75% of audits on plan	3.0
Completes ≥ 50% of audits on plan	2.0
Completes less than 50% of audits on plan	0.0

1 - Includes audit plan changes and/or substitutes

Measure 6.4.2 Consistent with Professional Auditing Standards receive an overall satisfactory rating from an external review every five years[2]

Performance Level	Measure Score
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with at least one outstanding comment or observation	3.9
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review	3.4
Receive an overall satisfactory rating with two or less findings	3.0
Receive an overall satisfactory rating with three or more findings	2.0
Receive an overall unsatisfactory rating	0.0

2 - This quinquennial review is scheduled for FY06

Measure 6.4.3 Replacement of all Ingres database applications developed and maintained by Management Information System (MIS)[3]

Performance Level	Measure Score
All applications replaced by 1/1/06	3.9
All applications replaced by 2/1/06	3.4
All applications replaced by 3/1/06	3.0
All applications replaced by 4/1/06	2.0
All applications replaced by 5/1/06	0.0

3 - This does not include Electronic Media or Hall B database applications

Measure 6.4.4 New MIS applications thoroughly documented, including approved customer requirements

Performance Level	Measure Score
100%	3.9
> 90%	3.4
> 80%	3.0
> 70%	2.0
< 70%	0.0

Measure 6.4.5 Critical MIS services availability during business hours

Performance Level	Measure Score
> 95%	3.9
> 92%	3.4
> 90%	3.0
> 85%	2.0
$\leq$ 85%	0.0

Objective 6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

The effectiveness of Technology Transfer activities at Jefferson Lab can be measured by three specific measures listed below. Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional

performance in areas outside the performance measures (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Measure 6.5.1 The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology as measured by Invention Disclosures and Patent Applications. Intellectual Property Stewardship as indicated by the annual number of Invention Disclosures and/or Patents awarded

Target 6.5.1.1 Invention Disclosures

Performance Level	Measure Score
Number of Invention Disclosures $\geq$ 9	3.9
Number of Invention Disclosures $\geq$ 7	3.4
Number of Invention Disclosures $\geq$ 5	3.0
Number of Invention Disclosures $\geq$ 3	2.0
Number of Invention Disclosures $\leq$ 1	0.0

Target 6.5.1.2 Patents Awarded

Performance Level	Measure Score
Number of patents awarded $\geq$= 4	3.9
Number of patents awarded $\geq$= 3	3.4
Number of patents awarded $\geq$= 2	3.0
Number of patents awarded $\geq$= 1	2.0
No Patents were awarded	0.0

Measure 6.5.2 The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities as measured by licenses and/or options agreements executed.

Performance Level	Measure Score
$\geq$ 2 Licenses Awarded and $\geq$ 2 Option Agreements Executed	3.9
$\geq$ 2 Licenses Awarded or $\geq$ 2 Option Agreements Executed	3.4
$\geq$ 1 Licenses Awarded and $\geq$ 1 Option Agreements Executed	3.0
1 License Awarded or 1 Option Agreement Executed	2.0
No Licenses Awarded or Option Agreements Executed	0.0

Measure 6.5.3 Contributions to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology as measured by customer assessments.

Points will be awarded based on the customer's overall adjectival rating of the system as follows:

A	B+	B	C	F
3.9	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

Table 6-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and					

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			25%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			25%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			15%		
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS

The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs.

The weight of this Goal is 5%.

The Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 7.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 7.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs

Measure 7.1.1Asset Condition Index (ACI):

The ACI is one (1) minus the Facility Condition Index (FCI). FCI is the ratio of Deferred Maintenance to Replacement Plant Value. The FCI is derived from data in FIMS.

Performance level	Measure Score
$\geq$ 98%	3.9
$\geq$ 95%	3.4
$\geq$ 90%	3.0
$\geq$ 75%	2.0
< 75%	0.0

Measure 7.1.2 Percentage of planned facility condition assessments completed during the fiscal year:

Condition assessments on trailers and shipping containers, smoke shacks, and small modular storage shed are not scheduled but are performed only as deemed prudent. Facilities not accessible due to operations are so documented and will be rescheduled.

Performance level	Measure Score
Completed on more than 30% of real property assets	3.9
Completed on more than 25% of real property assets	3.4
Completed on more than 20% of real property assets	3.0
Completed on 20% of real property assets	2.0
Completion on less than 20% of real property assets	0.0

Measure 7.1.3 Percentage of indirect projects completed from the planned project list for the fiscal year:

Indirect projects completed include those that are procured as well as those that have been closed out. The planned project list is determined after the budget has been finalized. Projects delayed by operations, including those displaced by higher priority projects, and so documented will be rescheduled. The new completion date will be used for performance level calculation.

Performance level	Measure Score
100%	3.9
$\geq$ 95%	3.4
$\geq$ 90%	3.0
$\geq$ 75%	2.0
< 75%	0.0

Objective 7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs

Measure 7.2.1Schedule Performance on CEBAF Center Addition: Actual completion compared to baseline completion.

Performance level	Measure Score
Ahead of schedule by more than 1 month	3.9
1 month behind to 1 month ahead of schedule	3.4
Behind by less than 2 months	3.0
Behind by less than 4 months	2.0
Behind by 4 months or more	0.0

Measure 7.2.2 Cost Performance on CEBAF Center Addition Project:

Cost performance will be measured based on the effective use of available funding to achieve maximum performance of the facility within the scope of the project as specified in the PEP.

Performance level	Measure Score
Enhanced performance features in facility	3.9
Facility completed as expected	3.4
No significant reduction in expected functionality	3.0
Reduced functionality in facility	2.0
Additional funding required to complete project	0.0

Measure 7.2.3 Cost Performance on Projects ≥ $100K.

Maintain level of construction control to limit change orders and cost overruns to only those which bring added value to the project or are appropriate to produce the desired end product. Performance level will be calculated by taking the average of initial bid (contracted) amounts compared to the final contract amounts considering all applicable funding increases for all appropriate contracts closed out during the rating period. Increases considered not applicable are those whose root cause is:

- •Post-design programmatic change by user (physical or schedule)
- •New technology deemed a value-added inclusion (post-award)
- •Value engineering proposals accepted (both additive and deductive)

Value determined will be expressed as a percent overrun.

Performance Level	Measure Score
No overrun	3.9
≤ 8%	3.4
> 8%	3.0
> 15%	2.0
> 25%	0.0

Measure 7.2.4 Scheduled Performance on Projects ≥ $100K.

Calculation of performance toward this goal will be the average of the actual number of days to completion of identified projects (or designated milestones) to the number specified by the original contracts. This will be expressed as a coefficient of actual divided by contracted. Additional time attributed to the following categories will not be included for the purpose of this metric:

- Acts of God (as contractually accepted)
- Labor disputes/strikes
- Documented material unavailability (contractually accepted)
- User desired post-award change orders for which additional time is appropriate

For purposes of this report, "completion" shall be when the project is physically complete; turned over to user or beneficial occupancy taken.

Performance Level	Measure Score
< 1.0	3.9
≥ 1.0 to < 1.10	3.5
≥ 1.10 to < 1.15	3.0
≥ 1.15 to < 1.25	2.0
≥ 1.25	0.0

Table 7-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

GOAL 8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

The weight of this Goal is 5%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more key measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the key measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 8.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

Measure 8.1.1Provision of effective emergency management system

Performance Level	Score
All scheduled and Director's Safety Council (DSC) approved FY06 follow on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed ahead of schedule. All FY06 exercises completed in the quarter scheduled. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates a high level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Lessons learned and experiences shared with other Office of Science (SC) or non-SC organizations.	**3.9**
80% of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time or ahead of schedule. Majority of FY06 exercises completed in quarter scheduled. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon.	**3.4**
A majority of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates a satisfactory level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon.	**3.0**
Less than half of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from	**2.0**

the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time. Lessons learned are not repeated. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates an inadequate level of proficiency	
Responses to actual emergency events demonstrate an inadequate level of proficiency and result in serious injury or significant property loss.	**0.0**

Objective 8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

Assure appropriate level of cyber security risk assessment and program planning and that Jefferson Lab computer systems are not compromised or used in attacks on other Internet locations.

Measure 8.2.1Compromises, attacks and reporting

Number of times JLab computer systems were compromised or were used to attack other Systems including that the incidents were reported within the required timeframes.

Potential Cyber Security Incidents (CSI) considered in this metric include system level (root) compromises on Computer Center and Accelerator Controls managed systems, as well as situations where nodes in the jlab.org domain are used to carry out cyber attacks on other locations on the Internet. Computer Center and Accelerator Controls staff will track incidents and report on them at the end of the fiscal year.

Performance Level	Measure Score
CSI = ≤ 1	3.9
CSI > 1 and ≤ 3	3.4
CSI > 3 and ≤ 5	3.0
CSI > 5 and ≤ 12	2.0
CSI > 12	0.0

Scoring: CSI = RC + .5(CA) where
RC = the number of incidents of system level (root) compromises on Computer Center or Accelerator Controls managed systems per year
CA = the number of incidents in which a node in the jlab.org domain is used to carryout a cyber attack on other locations on the Internet.

Measure 8.2.2 Employee and user awareness of cyber security vulnerabilities

This measure is based on the percentage of employees and users required to take the annual security and safety awareness training that includes cyber security.

Performance Level	Measure Score
> 95%	3.9
> 90%	3.4
>80%	3.0
>70%	2.0
≤ 70%	0.0

Measure 8.2.3 Performance on addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities.

Methodology: The metric will measure the average completion date and/or percent of systems complete for addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities versus the scheduled completion date and/or percent of systems complete. The scheduled completion dates and/or percent of systems to be completed will be negotiated between the TJSO Cyber Security Manager and the CIO

at the beginning of the performance period with an agreement in place within the first six weeks of the performance period.

Two types of identified cyber security vulnerabilities will be used:

Type A with M vulnerabilities - Scoring for vulnerabilities that have completion dates: The percentage of available points earned for each vulnerability (A_1, A_2, ..., A_M) shall be numerically equal to 100 plus (minus) 10 times the number of months (including fractions thereof) that the completion date for addressing the identified cyber security vulnerability is ahead (behind). No points will be awarded for a given vulnerability if the completion date is more than five months behind schedule. For the mid-year score, the coefficient shall be 20 rather than 10. The Contracting Officer may make allowance for project plan changes and/or schedule adjustments associated with causes beyond JLab's control. The dates used in evaluating performance at midyear and end-of-year are the project schedule dates in place at the time of evaluation.

Score A_i= 100 ± 10 x (no. of months) either ahead (+) or behind (-) for vulnerability A_i

Type B with N vulnerabilities - Scoring for vulnerabilities that have percent of systems complete: The percentage of available points earned for each vulnerability (B_1, B_2, ..., B_N) shall be numerically equal to 100 times the ratio of the number of systems that are complete divided by the number that were scheduled to be complete on the specified date (mid-year or end-of-year as appropriate) for addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities. The Contracting Officer may make allowance for project plan changes and/or schedule adjustments associated with causes beyond JLab's control.

Score B_i= 100 x (actual completed/scheduled completed) for vulnerability B_i

The scores for the two types of vulnerabilities will be combined as follows:

Score = ($ScoreA_1$+$ScoreA_2$+... +$ScoreA_M$ + $ScoreB_1$+$ScoreB_2$+...+$ScoreB_N$)/(M+N)

The Score shall be constrained to lie between 0 and 100.

40% The points shall equal Score x (points available)/100

Performance Level	Measure Score
$\geq$ 90	3.9
$\geq$ 85	3.4
$\geq$ 75	3.0
$\geq$ 65	2.0
< 65	0.0

Type A = A vulnerability correlated to completion date.
Type B = A vulnerability which correlates to a percentage that an identified system has been completed.
M = Total number of elements for Type A.
N = Total number of elements for Type B.

Objective 8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and Property

Measure 8.3.1 In the analysis of this area, the TJSO will consider Laboratory input described below in conjunction with other relevant factors to assign final score. The Laboratory's CIO, Admin AD, Director of Facilities Management and Security Manager shall perform an annual self assessment and provide an appropriate score for the following:

- Any issues with Other Nuclear Material, Site Security, or Unclassified Foreign Visits and Assignments are reported as required, including findings from reviews, assessments, audits, etc.
- The Other Nuclear Material, Site Security, or Unclassified Foreign Visits and Assignments program is included in the appropriate reviews, assessments, etc.
- Any issues/corrective actions with Other Nuclear Material, Site Security, or Unclassified Foreign Visits and Assignments are resolved and completed in a timely fashion.
- Staff and management are aware of their responsibilities with respect to Other Nuclear Material, Site Security, or Unclassified Foreign Visits and Assignments as appropriate.

Points awarded based on the results of the committee's overall adjectival rating of the system as follows:

A	B+	B	C	F
3.9	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee's assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Objective 8.4 Provide and Efficient and Effective Program for the Protection of Sensitive Information

Measure 8.4.1In the analysis of this area, the TJSO will consider Laboratory input described below in conjunction with other relevant factors to assign final score. The Laboratory's CIO, Admin AD, CFO and Cyber Security Manager shall perform an annual self assessment and provide an appropriate measurement score for the following:

- Any issues with sensitive information are reported as required, including findings from reviews, assessments, audits, etc.
- The sensitive information program is included in the appropriate reviews, assessments, etc.
- Any issues/corrective actions with sensitive information are resolved and completed in a timely fashion.
- Staff and management are aware of their responsibilities with respect to sensitive information as appropriate.

Points awarded based on the results of the committee's overall adjectival rating of the system as follows:

A	B+	B	C	F
3.9	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee's assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Table 8-1 Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the					

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			30%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			50%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			10%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8-2 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	**4.3-4.1**	**4.0-3.8**	**3.7-3.5**	**3.4-3.1**	**3.0-2.8**	**2.7-2.5**	**2.4-2.1**	**2.0-1.8**	**1.7-1.1**	**1.0-0.8**	**0.7-0**
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F